



TITLE:

INTRODUCTION TO LAND PROBLEM IN ENGLISH REVOLUTION

AUTHOR(S):

Horie, Hideichi

CITATION:

Horie, Hideichi. INTRODUCTION TO LAND PROBLEM IN ENGLISH
REVOLUTION. Kyoto University Economic Review 1963, 33(1): 1-26

ISSUE DATE:

1963-04

URL:

<https://doi.org/10.11179/ker1926.33.1>

RIGHT:

THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXXIII, No. 1

APRIL 1963

Whole No. 74

CONTENTS

**Introduction to Land Problem in
English Revolution**

Hideichi HORIE 1

**Unemployment Relief Work in
Japan**

Kaichi MAEGAWA 27

**Accumulation and Renewal of
Fixed Capital in Expanded
Reproduction**

Tatsuji YOSHIMURA 42

PUBLISHED BY

THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY
SAKYO-KU, KYOTO, JAPAN

KYOTO UNIVERSITY ECONOMIC REVIEW

MEMOIRS OF THE FACULTY OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE KYOTO UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XXXIII NUMBER 1 (APRIL 1963) WHOLE NUMBER 74

INTRODUCTION TO LAND PROBLEM IN ENGLISH REVOLUTION¹⁾

By Hideichi HORIE*

I. English Revolution—its inherent character

England, as it is well known, had opened up a way toward modern parliamentary government ahead of any other country of the world, overthrowing ancient regime of absolute monarchy in 17th century through the two civil revolutions viz. English Revolution (1640–60) and Glorious Revolution (1688). It was through the Glorious Revolution that her political development had come to be definitely directed to the modern parliamentarism. Thus it produced a tremendous effect not only upon English society but also upon the world. However this revolution was, in itself, but a confirmation or an endorsement of the political consequences brought

* Professor of Economics, Kyoto University.

1) This paper is the introductory chapter of a book edited by Hideichi Horie, entitled "Land Reform in English Revolution" in which the basic conception of the said book is outlined. The book consists of the following chapters: Chapter I, Introduction to Land Problem in English Revolution—by Hideichi Horie, Chapter II, Development of Capitalistic Relations in Peasant Economy—by Nobuo Take, Chapter III, Transformation of Landlord Economy into Capitalism—by Koichi Matsumura, Chapter IV, Land Struggles in English Revolution by Yoshiharu Ozaki. The summaries of these chapters (II–IV) will be published serially in this journal.

about by the class struggles in the preceding English Revolution.

Therefore, without analysing English Revolution, it would be impossible to clarify the nature of Glorious Revolution and, in turn, English modern society.

Thus our attention is focused to the English Revolution (1640-60) and particularly to the period when the Independents led by Oliver Cromwell had suppressed the rebellion of Levellers and consolidated the foundation of their regime.

As we stated above, the two revolutions, English Revolution and Glorious Revolution, had overthrown the ancient regime of absolute monarchy and paved the way toward the modern parliamentarism for the first time in the world history.

This political frontier pioneered by the British people in 17th century had been further pushed ahead in 18th century through the American Revolution (1775-83) as well as French Revolution (1789-94) and it culminated in a world-wide political principle. Thus, the English civil revolution bore world-historical significance in that it had achieved for the first time the transformation of ancient regime into modern society by providing a new political principle that found applications in many other countries. Though later in this paper a conservative character of English Revolution and the English modern society entailed by the former is to be pointed out, it would not in the least mean that the progressive role played by this revolution in the world history is to be belittled. On the contrary, we could estimate sufficiently the world-historical significance of English Revolution because it is the very revolution which had overthrown the absolute monarchy and opened the way to the modern parliamentarism.

Nevertheless, we feel a clear difference between English Revolution and French Revolution and also between English modern society and French modern society. The said difference had already been taken into consideration in the Japanese Liberal and Democratic Movement in 19th century (1874-84). In the fight against the bureaucratic despotism of Meiji government that tried to follow the pattern of German absolute monarchy, those engaged in this movement pursued either one of the two political images, that is, English type monarchical parliamentarism which was the ideal of Progressive Party and right wing of Liberal Party and French type of revolution that inspired the left wing of Liberal Party.

They were right when they felt the difference between English Revolution and French Revolution. Karl Marx commented on the "Conservativeness" of English Revolution, as distinguished from French Revolution by saying that "its conservatism is to be attributed to the permanent alliance

between the bourgeoisie and the greater part of the big landlords, an alliance which essentially differentiates the English Revolution from the French—the revolution that abolished big landownership by parcellation.”¹⁾ F. Engels also distinguished English Revolution from French Revolution by criticizing the former that “In England, the continuity of pre-revolutionary and post-revolutionary institutions, and the compromise between landlords and capitalists.”²⁾

Marx and Engels also evaluated the English Revolution by stating that in contrast to the French Revolution where they abolished feudalistic land proprietorship, in the English Revolution “an permanent alliance between Bourgeoisie and the greater part of big (feudalistic) landlords” and “the compromise between landlords and capitalists” had been achieved and the institutions before revolution had survived as they were. Thus, the difference, sensed by those engaged in the said movement in Japan, between these two revolutions is thereby most precisely and scientifically defined, and nobody could deny it. Therefore, although these two revolutions belong to the same category of bourgeois revolution, they have their own identity respectively having their individual aspects.

This difference is of greatly deep nature and even constitutes two contrasting types of bourgeois revolution.

Criticising F. Lassalle's drama *Franz von Sickingen*, Marx wrote to Lassalle, “Did you not yourself to a certain extent fall into the diplomatic error, like your *Franz von Sickingen*, of placing the Lutheran-Knightly opposition above the plebeian Muncerian opposition?”³⁾

So contrasted Marx the “Lutheran-Knightly opposition” to “plebeian and Muncerian opposition” or “plebeian=peasantry opposition” in the struggles against feudalistic rule. Marx and Engels arrived at this conception when they analysed the process of the Peasant War in Germany in 1525 based on their personal experiences acquired through the German Revolution in 1848 and thus they grouped up various internal camps engaged in the struggles against feudalistic domination, into this contrasting conception.⁴⁾

This basic conception of Marx and Engels had been later developed further by Lenin in his work entitled *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the*

1) K. Marx, *A Review of Guizot's Book, Why has the English Revolution been successful?*, Marx=Engels on Britain, Moscow, 1953. pp. 346-7.

2) Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Selected Works*, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1962, (5th impression), vol. ii, p. 107.

3) Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, p. 140.

4) cf. F. Engels, *Peasant War in Germany*.

Democratic Revolution, which he wrote for the Russian Revolution in 1905-7. In this book he contrasted "a revolution in which the landlord and big bourgeois element will preponderate" and "a revolution in which peasant and proletarian element will preponderate". Lenin criticised the theory of bourgeois revolution in general by Mensheviki, saying. "He would be a fine Marxist indeed, who in a period of democratic revolution failed to see the difference between the degrees of democracy, the difference of its various forms and confined himself to 'clever' remarks to the effect that, after all, this is 'a bourgeois revolution', the fruits of a 'bourgeois revolution'."¹⁾

He further, criticizing the theory of bourgeois revolution by Mensheviki, argued positively, "If we are not strong enough to bring the revolution to a successful conclusion, if the revolution terminates in a 'decisive victory' in the *Osvobozhdeniye* sense, i. e., exclusively in the form of a representative assembly convened by the Tsar, which could be called a constituent assembly, —then this will be a revolution in which *the landlord and big bourgeois* element will preponderate. On the other hand, if we are destined to live through a really great revolution, if history prevents a 'miscarriage' this time, if we are strong enough to carry the revolution to a successful conclusion, to a decisive victory, not in the *Osvobozhdeniye* or the new *Iskra* sense of the word, then it will be a revolution in which the peasant and proletarian element will preponderate."²⁾

Thus he contrasted "a revolution in which landlord and big bourgeois element preponderates"=liberalistic revolution against "a revolution in which peasant and proletarian element preponderates"=the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, and he fought for the victory of the latter.

It is clear that the "two tactics" in democratic revolution, which have been contrasted by Lenin as the revolution in which "landlord and big bourgeois element is preponderate" and revolution in which "peasant and proletariat element preponderates" is the metamorphosis, at a certain development stage, of the contrast theory of Marx and Engels which has been explained in the foregoing paragraph as the contrast between "Lutheran-Knightly opposition" and "plebeian and peasant opposition."³⁾

This theory of contrast by Marx, Engels and Lenin is a formulated expression of the internal confrontation of the revolutionary camp in the respective bourgeois revolution, and at the same time it has set the

1) V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works in Two Volumes*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol. 1, Part 2, pp. 51-2.

2) V. I. Lenin, op. cit., pp. 45-6.

3) cf. Hideichi Horie (ed.), *Theory of Civil Revolution* (in Japanese), Part II.

pattern of bourgeois revolution by defining that the result of revolution shall be determined according as which group of the two will win the victory. Contrary to the French Revolution in the period of Jacobinical Dictatorship where plebeian and peasant faction was predominant, English Revolution was the one in which "Lutheran-knightly faction=Landlord and big bourgeois element" had won the victory, and this is the very reason why Marx and Engels have evaluated the English Revolution as a conservative type.¹⁾

Thus though English Revolution opened up a new frontier in the world history as a bourgeois revolution in a broader sense, it was of "conservative" type revolution in contrast to French Revolution. Such observation, however, is not representing the orthodox school in our country, and the predominant interpretation of English Revolution is against us. Mr. Kohachiro Takahashi summarizes the most popular Japanese interpretation of English Revolution as follows:

"In England are here alone, the modern capitalistic proprietorship of land has been spontaneously and economically brought into existence, while in other countries, it had to go through their respective 'peasant emancipation' in civil revolutions specific to its own to realize modernization of land proprietorship. In French Revolution, according to the Declaration of the Rights of Man, the inviolability of private property right was asserted while the abolishment of *Flurzwang* and the freedom of land enclosure i. e., the liberty of commodity production and cultivation, and the restriction of common rights were declared. Particularly the feudalistic rent was abolished with no compensation under Jacobins dictatorship in its efforts to put an end to the system of lord of the manor. Through such process, the peasants were emancipated from feudalistic domination and they became completely free proprietors of the lands they tilled....Whereas, the German 'Peasant Liberation' (*Bauernbefreiung*) in the first half of the 19th century that initiated by the "Reform" of Stein=Hardenberg on the soil of *Gutsherrschaft* in east Germany, had failed to create free independent peasants.

1) cf. Yoshiharu Ozaki, "Theory of English Revolution—," Horie (ed.), *Theory of Civil Revolution*, Chapter IV; C. Hill, "The English Civil War interpreted by Marx and Engels", Science and Society, Vol. XII, No. 1.

Internationally acknowledged evaluation of English Revolution especially of its inherent character seems to be identical, in its main, with our interpretation as introduced in this paper, although differences are seen in minor points. In England you may refer, for example, these literatures: M. James, *Social Problems and Policy during the English Revolution*, 1930, Ch. Hill (ed.), *The English Revolution*, 1948.

M. Dobb, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*, 1946, esp. Chap. IV.

As for those of Soviet Russia

N. Take, "Studies in the English Revolution in Soviet Russia", Vol. I, II (Keizai Ronso [Economic Review] of Kyoto Univ. Vol. 78, No. 1, 2) and "Characteristics of Agricultural Problems in English Revolution", *Outline of Socio-Economic History*, (in Japanese), Vol. IV.

On the contrary the landlords, through this liberation, remarkably expanded their land ownership, improved their economic status and reinforced their position and as the result, '*Junker* system' had been perfected."¹⁾

As regards English Revolution, Mr. Takahashi further explains in detail as follows:

"Mr. Hisao Otsuka, in his book entitled 'Introduction to European Economic History' Vol. 1, (1944) excellently analyses the historical process of how English feudalistic landownership=serfdom had decomposed, how money rent system was established and serfs were practically liberated and how the independent self-sustaining peasants class was widely formed as the result of such liberation and how modern society=capitalistic relations had developed incessantly out of a rapid self-differentiation of such independent self-sustained peasants=petty commodity-producers and how they were relayed to Puritan Revolution."²⁾

This is the formulation of the patterns of agrarian modernization process which took place in England, France and Germany, by the so-called Otsuka School. The three patterns formulated thereunder are, the land reform by landlords in Germany who aimed at *Junker* system, the reform by peasants in French Revolution who aimed at the creation of peasant proprietorship of land parcels and the spontaneous development of peasant proprietorship of land parcels, and the differentiation of peasantry as taken place in England. Mr. Mikitoshi Takeuchi further summarizes the English pattern, stating that "the fundamental significance of the agrarian and land problem in the Puritan Revolution does not lie in land division itself (because it is thought to have spontaneously taken place long before the Revolution), but in that it re-confirmed post-facto the differentiation toward modern capitalistic relations, which had already actively started within absolute monarchy."³⁾

Thus in Otsuka school, the land reformations in England and France are grouped up into the same land reformation by peasantry and are placed in contrast to German land reformation by landlords. They think that the difference lies in the fact that in England the peasants in land parcels had been created before civil revolution and then they had capitalistically differentiated, while in France such peasants who own land parcels

1) K. Takahashi, "Landlord Proprietorship of Land and Commodity Production", *Development of Sericulture and Landlord System* (in Japanese), edited by K. Takahashi and T. Furushima, Chapt. I, pp. 33-4.

2) K. Takahashi, *Structure of Civil Revolution* (in Japanese). p. 34.

3) M. Takeuchi, "Agrarian and Land Problems in Puritan Revolution", *Category of Rent in Revolutionary Period* (in Japanese), edited by M. Yamada, Part I, Chapt. I. i, p. 21.

were created and established in the revolution itself.¹⁾

Contrary to what is contended by Otsuka school, we maintain that the English Revolution inherently tackled the land problem and that it solved in harmony with the interests of land proprietors. Our interpretation there-confronts the historical evaluation of English Revolution made by Otsuka school which is the dominant view in our country.

II. Feudalistic Land Proprietorship—Economic Foundation of Absolute Monarchy

Bourgeois Revolution is in general a political process by which feudalistic system is reformed into modern system. The feudalistic system, which is the primary target to be destroyed by Bourgeois revolution, includes all social structures such as political, juridical and administrative institutions that originated from the royal sovereignty, as well as those established by churches or based upon feudalistic economy. Bourgeois revolution is thus to perform a modern, forcible reformation of the entire feudalistic social structure. However the core of feudalistic system which was to be reformed through revolution was undoubtedly the feudalistic hierarchy and the royal sovereignty which was supported by and stood on the summit of such hierarchy, as well as the feudalistic land proprietorship which supported the entire feudalistic class structure including the regality. Therefore, we must first give a concrete explanation of feudalistic land proprietorship and feudalistic class structure as existed in England in the first half of 17th century.

There is one comment which must precede such explanation. There is, in our country the predominant view is that at the time of the English Revolution, there existed no feudalistic land proprietorship in England. Mr. Otsuka states, in his book *Introduction to European Economic History*, as the ultimate conclusion of his book, that 'the typical development of "clothiers in county", a very smooth development of "manufacture" and the spontaneous movement toward industrial revolution; these were only possible and inevitable on the basis of rapid collapse of feudalistic land proprietorship and the formation of yeomanry which were characteristic to the history of land proprietorship in England. This is the proof that the core of problem was in the rural districts and in the land system.'²⁾

1) Since it has become evident that the theory of Otsuka school on the agricultural development in England does not agree with and can not explain various historical facts, they have changed the appearance of their theory, though they yet maintain the fundamental thought as explained here. The current presentation of Otsuka school is considerably different from those stated above, but we will touch on that later.

2) H. Otsuka, *Introduction to European Economic History*, p. 222.

"The rapid collapse of feudalistic land proprietorship and formation of yeomary" as pointed out by Mr. Otsuka implies the "establishment of money rent and the de facto liberation of serfs and formation of thick layer of independent, self-sustained peasants and the rapid self-differentiation of these independent peasants=petty commodity-producers; in other words, the mass formation of proprietor peasants of land parcels and its modern differentiation. This understanding relates itself to the interpretation of Mr. Takahashi and Mr. Takeuchi that such process as mentioned above had already occurred and the system had been firmly established before the English Revolution and the Revolution was nothing but the post facto re-confirmation of such social reform.

Thus Otsuka school believes that English Revolution did not have the land problem to solve—the problem of feudalistic land proprietorship. Their theory has later metamorphosed into variety of variations but this fundamental contention has not changed. Mr. Takeuchi stated also recently that "the significance of English Revolution should be sought in its confrontation against various economic regulations by absolutism rather than in the direct abolishment of landlord system which was characteristic to the feudalism,"¹⁾ thus he contends that the land problem itself did not exist in the English Revolution.

The understanding of Mr. Otsuka of the characteristics of land system in England as introduced above is completely erroneous theoretically as well as in light of historical facts. The main subject of this paper is to illustrate by historical facts the feudalistic land proprietorship and feudalistic class order at the time of English Revolution, but prior to it, we should like to make clear the theoretical mistake involved in the interpretation of Otsuka school.

In "Genesis of Capitalist Ground-Rent", Vol. III, Chapt. XLVII of *Capital*, Marx analysed the process of decomposition of feudalistic land proprietorship from the viewpoint of rent and explained the process of change from labor rent,→rent in kind→money rent (these steps represent also the steps of decomposition within feudalistic land proprietorship) and finally to the *métayage* and the peasant proprietorship of land parcels which was the direct result of the dissolution of feudalistic rent. What is explained here is the general law, in other words what Lenin called the "theory", of the dissolution of feudalistic land proprietorship.

In the first paragraph of "Exploitation of the Agricultural Population

1) M. Takeuchi, "Agrarian and Land Problems in Civil Revolution", *Lectures on Western Economic History*, Vol. IV, p. 14.

from the Land" Vol. I, Part VIII, Chapt. XXVII of *Capital*, this general law is applied to England. He comments that "In England, serfdom had practically disappeared in the last part of the 14th century. The immense majority of the population consisted then, and to a still larger extent, in the 15th century, of free peasant proprietors, whatever was the feudal title under which their right of property was hidden".¹⁾ It is evident that the "disappearance of serfdom" in England pointed out here by Marx means the appearance of money rent or rent commutation, and if so, the "disappearance of serfdom" is the internal metamorphosis of feudalistic land proprietorship and the loosening of feudalistic proprietary system, but by no means it meant the abolishment of feudalistic rent and the formation of peasant proprietors of land parcels. Therefore the "free peasant proprietors" which followed are not the proprietors of land parcels as meant in Vol. III, Chapt. XLVII, of *Capital*, but they are the peasant proprietors of land parcels whose right was "hidden under the feudalistic title", in other words, the so-called "de facto" peasant proprietors of land parcels who owned land under the feudalistic land system. Chapter XXVII further explains in detail the process of expropriation of peasants from land—the so-called "enclosure movement". However such expropriation of peasants from land by landlord is unthinkable unless the feudalistic land proprietorship is presupposed. When Marx applied the general law of disappearance of feudalistic land proprietorship to England, he did not presuppose that the change from money rent system to peasant proprietorship of land parcels was achieved in straight line, but his observation of the evolution of English agriculture is based on the recognition that the feudalistic land proprietorship as a matter of fact existed in the form of money rent.²⁾ The error which Mr. Otsuka committed in comprehending "the characteristic of the history of land system in England" is thought to be due to the misreading of the opening paragraph of Vol. I, Chapt. XXVI, of *Capital*.

In the following, we will cite a few examples of historical facts which contradict to Otsuka's Theory.

We believe that the feudalistic land proprietorship and class system were the main targets which were attacken by the English Revolution. They were not however the land proprietorship and class system in the feudalism in general but they were those crystallized in the absolute

1) K. Marx, *Capital*, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1954, vol. 1, p. 717.

2) We do not underestimate significance of the wide formation of the "de facto" peasant of land parcels in England and the ensuing differentiation of peasant class, but contrary to Otsuka's Theory, we contend that it is a "de facto" proprietorship. The difference of opinions between the two is however a very significant one.

monarchy in the first half of 17th century. Here we have to touch briefly on the development process of the feudalistic land proprietorship and class system in England.

The land proprietorship which existed at the time of English Revolution was a feudalistic multi-layer proprietary and the administrative organization and class order based on such multi-layer proprietary. The primary owners of feudal land were of course the landlords ranking from the peers down to the gentry. However these owners were not the sole absolute owners of the land as we commonly understand the landowners to be. The ownership of landlord was limited in fact from both ends, their superior and subordinate. In those days land was enfeoffed by the King to his immediate subordinates, who in turn enfeoffed such land to his subordinates. Thus the land was owned by multi-layer ruling classes and the landlord had to render feudalistic duties, particularly the homage and knight service to his superior landlords and ultimately to the King, from whom he received the feoff. Here the relation of delivery of land in itself composed the system of ruling and class order. Thus on the proprietorship of land of feudal lord was a pile of multi-layer proprietary, by his superior lords and ultimately by the King and therefore their real ownership of land was so much restricted.

Moreover, the land ownership of the lord of manor was, in fact, restricted from below by the land holding of peasants. Now, let's see the problem, putting aside the two factors, that is, (1) the free land held by freeholders which was actually very close to the modern private land ownership and then (2) demesne, which was directly managed by the feudal lords with requisition of villains' services. The land in villainage run by peasants was a land possessed by a lord and yet villains held the right to farm it as a real right in so far as they fulfilled the services and other feudal incidents, and it was therefore a feudal land proprietorship being restricted from below by such peasantry land holding. In other words, the villains were entirely different from the modern tenants in that the former had the real right to farm, but such land holding by villains was subordinated to the land proprietorship by a feudal lord and constituted the material foundation on which to cause peasants to be controlled as non-free subordinates by the lord and force them to pay the feudal land-rent. Thus, a feudal land proprietorship was a multi-layer land proprietorship by the King through peasants and a vertical inter-restrictive land proprietorship. The above point must be first of all confirmed.

What is explained above was the outline of feudal English society consolidated by the Norman dynasty, but its feudal land proprietorship and class order changed as time passed. At first, changes taken place among

the feudal lords will be explained. The class relation among feudal lords based on the fief and military services came to be shifted from the human master-servant relation to a monetary one as the duty of military service was replaced with scutage or shield money in 1156 and the knight fees of the secondary feudal relation and lower were allowed to be purchased in 1290 on condition that the purchaser should perform all the duties of the preceding holder. Also, through the subsequent processes of feudal centralization and the reorganization of feudal system, on one hand, the upper land proprietorship to restrict the actual feudal land property of lords came to be concentrated to the King as the sovereign lord and, on the other hand, the non-economic compulsions on peasantry which are subordinated to the actual feudal land proprietorship of the lords came gradually to be separated from individual feudal land proprietorship and absorbed into the King's sovereignty. Thus the original relations of feudal land holding and feudal class order was converted from the original relation of human subordination to that of monetary subordination and, at the same time, reorganized into a simple relation of King→actual feudal land-lords→subordinated peasants. Yet, an actual feudal land proprietorship continued to be restricted both from above and below by the upper proprietorship of the King as the sovereign lord and the holding right of subordinated peasants. The Prohibitions of Enclosure issued after the regime of Henry VII and the Court of Wards and Liveries originated by Henry VIII in 1541 were the feudal restriction or the feudal charge given to the actual feudal land proprietorship by the absolute monarchy on the basis of the said King's sovereignty.

The feudal relations of land property and holding between an actual feudal lord and subordinated peasants also changed. The process of "commutation of rent" which is said to have been completed in 15th Century converted the burden on subordinated peasants who had sustained the rent by labour to the monetary rent. This process enabled to change the rent by labour to a low and fixed monetary rent, thereby lightening the peasant's rental burden all the more through subsequent fall of monetary value or inflation and further made it possible for peasants to let and rent their land holdings among themselves on condition that they should obtain approval of the lord by surrender and admission in the court of manor. A land holding by peasants got closer to an "actual" land proprietorship and the subordinated peasants came closer to the "de facto" freeholders. However, these changes were only "de facto" ones and the process of "commutation" did not liberate the subordinated peasants from the feudal land holding but merely converted them to customary tenants or copyholders. The customary tenants and the copyholders only held the land possessed by the lord,

the former according to the custom of manor and the latter according to the terms defined by the copy of the court roll, and both of them equally were subordinated to the feudal lord as the former villains were, having to fulfill the same feudal duties in essence as imposed on the villains. There were copyholds in inheritance, or for a life or lives, or for a certain term of years. As to copyholds other than that in inheritance, when the term expired, the land had to be surrendered to the lord and be held anew by payment of a fine and in accordance with the conditions requested by the lord. The copyhold which was relatively stabilized in its position also had two different types; the copyhold in inheritance which became closer to the freehold and that for a short-term of years which became closer to the leasehold. Though the copyhold or the customary tenure became closer to the "actual" freehold, it was after all a peasantry land-holding subjected to the feudal land property, restricting on the one hand the lord's land property from below but being tightly restricted on the other hand by the lord's feudal land property.

The feudal land property and class order faced by the English Revolution had, as explained above, triple relations among the King's supreme land ownership, the feudal land property by actual feudal lords, and the peasantry land holding, and these three factors were restricting each other in the vertical relation. It was such special feudal relations of land property that supported the absolute monarchy. The said relations of land property will be roughly summarized as below :

Table 1. Land property relations in England and Wales

King's sovereignty	{	Demesne and leasehold land	9,070,000 acres
Land property of lords (including..... Crown estates)		(Lease-holder 90,000)	
		Peasantry customary land	10,000,000 acres
	{	(Customary tenants and copyholders	477,000)
Peasants freeholdland freeholders		153,000)	1,913,000 acres
Total farm land in England and Wales (720,000 peasants)			20,983,000 acres

Note: The figures of this table were calculated as follows:

- 1) The total number of peasants in England and Wales includes the freeholders, the cottage farmers, and the leaseholders as calculated by Gregory King (G. King, *Two Tracts*, ed. by G. E. Barnett. p. 31). The total farm land in England and Wales is the sum of 11,000,000 acres of arable land and 10,000,000 acres of meadow and pasture *ibid.*, p. 35).
- 2) The number of lease-holders, customary tenants and copy-holders and freeholders were calculated from the said total number of peasants according to the Tawney's proportion (R. H. Tawney, *The Agrarian Problem*, p. 25). Also, the acrages of customary land and freehold land were respectively calculated by multiplying the Tawney's average peasant holding in the categories (*ibid.*, pp. 24-27, 32-33, 64-65) with the number of respective peasants. The acreages of demesne area and leaseholds area were figured out by deducting the said acreages of customary land area and freeholdland area from the said total farm land area and freehold land area from the said total farm land area.

When viewed both from the basic data and from the method of estimation, the figures are doubtful as to the extent to which they represent the true situation of that age, and yet they would serve to form a rough idea of the land property in those days. The tract of land held by the feudal lords reached 19 million acres occupying 90% of the total farm land while the acreage under peasant's freehold or the peasant's land holding substantially free from the feudal land property was only 1.9 million acres or less than 10% of the total farm area. The land property by feudal lords comprised, on one hand, the peasantry customary land (including the copyholds) which occupied one half of the total farm land and where the triple restriction among the King, the lords and the peasants was dominating, and, on the other hand, the demesne and the leaseholds which occupied 45% of the total farm land where single proprietorship of the lord was dominating. Thus, the agricultural acreage corresponding to 45% of the total after deduction of the tract of lord's demesne and leasehold land free from the peasantry land holding, and the area of peasant's freeholds free from the feudal land property—this peasantry customary land in a broader sense was the multi-layer feudal land property where 65% of the total peasant families were working. The above is the feudal relations of land property and feudal class order faced by the English Revolution.¹⁾

We have explain above, the feudal relations of land property and class order in contradiction to the Otsuka's theory, but the Otsuka's theory to which we contrasted our opinion is the old one while new Otsuka's theory definitely admits a feudal relations of land property which was faced by the English Revolution and therefrom tries to define the character of the English Revolution. Nevertheless, the feudal land property meant by the new Otsuka's theory is entirely different from our opinion. In *Stratification of Peasantry in England in the Late Middle Age*, in; *Studies on Parasitic Landowner System*, ed. by The Economic Society of Fukushima University, Mr. Akihiko Yoshioka found the same parasitic landowners in England as that existed in Japan and considers that such landowner system was the feudal economic basis to support the English absolute monarchy. According to Mr. Yoshioka, therefore, the feudal land property confronted with the English Revolution was the parasitic land-lord land property. The parasitic land-lord System he found in England means the relation that stratification took place among the peasants who hold land in the way of customary tenure, copyhold or

1) The above shown table uses the estimation presented in the report of Y. Ozaki at general meeting of Tochi Seidoshi Gakkai (Society of Agricultural History) in the fall of 1961. The table is given here only to summarize the complex discussions, and the figures shown there should not be regarded too important.

leasehold, and the rising peasants subletted the accumulated tracts of land to the downfalling ones instead of running it by themselves. The Yoshioka's theory, supported by Mr. Otsuka's theory on rural community appeared to monopolize the popularity in the circle concerned. Though we do not go into detail in this report, the theory is wrong in the following points. First, Yoshioka's theory, alike the old Otsuka theory, considers that the feudal land property by feudal lords was destroyed to give rise to peasant proprietors of land parcels and therefore that the feudal land property and the lord-peasant relations extinguished. Thus, it tried to replace the feudal land property with the parasitic landlord land ownership developed among the peasants themselves. That is to say, the Yoshioka's theory admitted the old Otsuka's theory as such in a certain points and yet, failing to explain logically the historical facts of the English Revolution, only contemplated to reinforce the latter theory. If so, our logical criticism to the Otsuka's theory is direct applicable to the Yoshioka's. In fact, the feudal land property undeniably existed as we have already explained, without counting upon such parasitic land-lord system. Second, the parasitic land-lord system meant here is a derivative form of such peasant's land holding that is subordinated for itself to the feudal land property and yet opposes against it, and it is the form which is developed on the basis of advance of the peasant's land holding into a land owning. Then, it is naturally unreasonable to define such parasitic land-lord proprietorship of land as a (semi-) feudal land proprietorship. A trial to demonstrate (semi-) feudalism of parasitic land-lord system through the community theory of Mr. Otsuka¹⁾ or the labour process theory of Mr. Yamada²⁾ would only be to fail, for, even is the Germanic *Gemeinschaft* or intermingled field system might have been precapitalistic, it would not be feudalistic itself.³⁾ Third, what is more embarrassing is that even if the parasitic land-lord system be accepted as a (semi-) feudal land property, the elaborate and unquestionable demonstrations by N. Shinozuka and M. Hamada have disproved that of Yoshioka and showed

1) Hisao Otsuka, "Basic Theory of Community" (in Japanese) Chapt. 3, Paragraph 3; *History of European Economy* (in Japanese) Chapt. 3.

2) Shun Yamada, *Analysis of Structure of Japanese Feudalism*, Chapt. 4. As regards its application to English situation, cf. *Formation of Land-Lord System*, by Akihiko Yoshioka. Though Mr. Yoshioka and Mr. Yamada do not agree with Mr. Otsuka in other points, the present writer treated the three en bloc as they are all of the same opinion in the present discussion.

3) K. Marx, in his *Formen, Die Der Kapitalistischen Produktion Vorhergehen*, while pointing out that the Asiatic form, the ancient form of community are historical premises for the general slavery, the ancient slavery and the serfdom, he yet distinguishes the one from the other saying that the latter are always "secondary" to the former. The relation between the two is just like such that the mere commodity and money are the historical premises for the capitalism and yet they are not within the capitalistic category as they are, and the Germanic community is not feudalistic in itself. Same is true with the labour process.

that the parasitic land-lord system cannot be called the dominating land property system in England.¹⁾ I would be no exaggeration to say that the Yoshioka's theory has thus lost its positive foundation. Our elucidation given as above on the feudal land property faced by the English Revolution is enough to stand also against the new Otsuka theory.

III. Abolishment of Feudalistic Land Property—Land Reform in the English Revolution

As explained so far, the feudalistic land property faced by the English Revolution was the one which was restricted triple-fold by the royal supreme land property, actual feudalistic land property by feudal lords, and peasant's land holding, and thus, the feudal class order faced by the English Revolution was the triple-fold domination—subordination relations among the King, lords and peasants regulated by the said triple land proprietorship. The land property that supported the absolute monarchy was such feudalistic land property, while the Royalists in the English Revolution tried to maintain the said feudalistic land property and the said triple-class feudal domination and subordination relations supported by it. This assertion constitutes the pivot of our study on the English Revolution.

Against the absolute monarchy that tried to maintain and carry over such feudalistic land property and class order, the resistance and criticism of the people as seen in many peasant's revolts gained ground. Also, growing resistance and criticism were raised by the Parliament, particularly by the ruling people as intensively represented in the House of Commons in the Stuart age, at the latest after early 17th Century. Especially the resistance and criticism of the House of Commons against Charles I in the reign of Stuart brought so much pressure on him that he was compelled to realize "Personal-government" or Laud-Strafford Regime. Such resistance and criticism of the people and the Parliament united themselves into a broad revolutionary camp in the English Revolution, and were directed toward realization and creation of a new relations of land property and class order or abolition of the royal prerogative, a legal and political expression of the feudalistic

1) N. Shinozuka, "Social Differentiation of the Peasantry in the Sixteenth Century" (in Japanese), *Shigaku-Zasshi* (Historical Journal of Japan) Vol. LXVII, No. 1.

M. Hamada, "Social Differentiation of the Peasantry in England in the Fifteenth Century" (in Japanese), *Seiyōshi Kenkyū* (Historical Journal of Europe), No. 6. As regards the theory of formation of parasitic land lord land property, refer to *The Agricultural Structure of Japan in the Period of Meiji Restoration* (in Japanese) edited by myself. My writer's report under the same title carried in *Economic Review of the Kyoto University*, Vol. XXXI No. 2 and No. 3 is the same as the Chapter I of the said book.

land property and class order supporting the absolute monarchy. However, in order for the resistance and criticism against the absolute monarchy to be united into the revolutionary camp in the English Revolution, they had to have a new relations of proprietorship and class order or a new economic order believing that such feudalistic relations of land property and class order were the yoke and unable to make social advance without destroying them. The resistance and criticism united into the revolutionalists were the social and political expression of this new economic order and the new relations of proprietorship as well as class order born out of the former, their expression in human consciousness and action. Here we must make clear the new economic order that supported the then social and political factors that caused the English Revolution to be a historical necessity—the new relations of proprietorship and class order to cope with the said feudalistic land property and class order.

It goes without saying that the said new economic order was the capitalistic economy which was born then and developing. To be more concrete, the new relations of proprietorship and class order—such as the manufacture and capitalist domestic industry developing since the middle of the 16th Century in the field of industry, and the agriculture at the stage of “small commodity production” that started to develop from the 14th Century to 15th Century—naturally sensed that the old feudalistic land property and class order were the yoke and were fighting against them. However, to make closer observation, though it is generally axiomatic in itself, it could not explain the progress of the matter on concrete basis because the approach is too general and abstract. As long as the feudalistic land property which supported the absolute monarchy was the multiple land property consisting of the royal supreme land property, actual land property by lords and the peasants land holding, the agricultural capitalism that developed in coping with the feudalistic land property could not but develop within, and not outside of the said feudalistic relations of land property. And for this reason they come to feel it a yoke. Then, those who advanced the agricultural capitalism under the said feudalistic land property were the two classes, one of which was the actual feudal lord as the owner of feudal land in the mutually restrictive relation and the other were the peasants who held the land under the former, and the development of agricultural capitalism must actually mean the shifting of the lords and peasants to capitalists. Lenin, in his *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, explained development of agricultural capitalism not as its development in general but as the development of agricultural capitalism by two ways of “Chapter II Disintegration of the Peasantry” and “Chapter III The Landowners

Transition from Corvee to Capitalist". When such general and abstract stage of theory as the general development of capitalism has taken the more definite form of the two capitalistic developments of lords and peasants, we are able to proceed to analyse the development of actual capitalism. Thus, we will discuss "Development of Capitalistic Relations in Peasant Economy" and "Transition of land-lord economy to capitalistic economy" prior to analysing land reform in the English Revolution.

The "Development of Capitalistic Relations in Peasant Economy" means and is limited to "disintegration of peasantry" among the customary tenants, especially copyholders based on the customary tenure or copyhold subordinated to the feudalistic land property. Even though such "disintegration of peasantry" involves such parasitic land-lord land property as referred to in the previous chapter, it is demonstrated already that the wealthy peasants having large-scale farming and high rate of land enclosed by peasant accumulated their land holdings and the poor peasants who lost their land holdings had small scale farming, and there is no doubt that the "disintegration of peasantry" into the well-to-do and the poor was developed on the basis of the said land holding situation. In so far as the "disintegration of peasantry" was to be advanced on the basis of the said land holding, in order that the "disintegration of peasantry" might advance and get stability, the feudalistic land property that restricted the basic land holding had to be abolished and the peasant's land holding had to be elevated to the level of the peasant proprietorship of land parcels. Otherwise, there must have been no alternative for peasants to protect themselves from the violence and the enclosure by the feudal lords. The "Development of Capitalistic Relations in Peasant Economy" thus directs itself toward advancement to peasant proprietorship of land parcels or the abolition of the feudalistic land property by peasantry.¹⁾ The "Transition from land-lord economy to capitalistic economy" was the process where the actual lords expropriated the peasantry from their land holding which restricted their own land holding, in order to absorb the fruits of economic development in opposition to the peasantry becoming more and more bourgeoisique. The feudal lords had to deprive peasantry of their old land holding and convert it to perfect private land of their own, in order to freely increase the rent and fine, raise high profit out of sheep-farming by enclosing their estate or to profitably lease the enclosed land. This meant the conversion of the peasant's land holdings into lord's demesne or leasehold, and as shown by table I, 45% of the total farm land had been converted from the peasant's

1) Chapter II of our book discusses this problem.

land holding to the free lord's private land in 17th Century. Thus, the feudal land property by the actual feudal lords got rid of the multiple restriction by expropriation of the peasantry from their land holding and was converted into perfectly private land of the lords.¹⁾

Marx stated, as to the two opposing trends of development of lord and peasants relations in the money-rent, "In its further development, money-rent must lead.....either to the transformation of land into peasants' freehold, or to the form corresponding to the capitalist mode of production, that is, to rent paid by the capitalist tenant farmer"²⁾ and explained in further detail, "with money-rent prevailing, the traditional and customary legal relationship between landlord and subject who possess and cultivate a part of the land, is necessarily turned into a pure money relationship fixed contractually in accordance with the rules positive law.....This transformation serves on the one hand, provided other general production relations permit, to expropriate more and more the old peasant possessors and to substitute capitalist tenants in their stead. On the other hand, it leads to the former possessor buying himself free from his rent obligation and to his transformation into an independent peasant with complete ownership of the land he tills".³⁾ The writer suggested how the two opposing transformations referred to by Marx as above progressed in the history of England. The two courses of development of agricultural capitalism suggested by the writer direct themselves to modern private land ownership in getting rid of the multiple restriction between the feudalistic land property by actual lords and the peasant's land holding. However, the directions are inverse—the development of peasant's capitalism directs itself toward peasant's privately owned land, that is to say, peasant proprietorship of land parcels, doing away with the feudalistic land property by actual lords, while on the contrary, the development of lord's capitalism converts directly feudalistic land property into the landlord's private land ownership by taking over the peasants land-holding. These two directions are contradictory and incompatible with each other and either one should gain the victory, for there is no middle of the road between the two. If one wins, the other must be defeated.

I have just suggested the so-called natural historical process on the development of agrarian capitalism in England and the land reform demanded by the former. The two directions of land reform that vie with

1) This process is mainly discussed in Vol. I Chapter XXVII, of *Capital*.

2) K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 778-9.

Chapter III of our book deals with this problem.

3) K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, pp. 778-9.

each other in this natural historical process exploded in the form of bloody internal struggle of the revolutionary camp that fought against the royalists during the English Revolution. "Struggle for Land Reform in the English Revolution" revealed itself as conflict between the opposing programmes of the divided parties who pursued the different direction of land reform.

If we call the course of land reform by peasants and that by landlord respectively "The American path" and "the Prussian path" according to Lenin's *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution 1905-7*,¹⁾ Levellers' demands corresponds to "the American path" while that of Parliamentarians consisted of Presbyterians and Independents followed "the Prussian path".

The victory of the Independents in English Revolution meant the defeat of "American path"=land reform by peasantry, and the victory of the Prussian path=the "revolution in which the landlord and big bourgeois element will preponderate".²⁾ The Glorious Revolution established the latter course in English society. The English Revolution threw the two paths existent as natural historical process into the nation-wide class struggle and determined the ultimate victory³⁾ out of the two.

What was meant by the famous passage of Marx which described the conservative character of English Revolution as cited in chapter 1 is nothing else but what is mentioned above.

When Mr. Toshiyuki Toya in 1937, and I myself independently from

1) Refer to my *Theory on the Structure of Industrial Capitalism* revised edition, particularly to Chapter 5, "Categorical Theory on the Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism".

Here I said that "the Prussian path" won in the English Revolution but it does not mean that English agricultural system itself was same as that of Prussia. Even in case of the land reform by landlord or of "Prussian path", the agricultural system of each country could vary according to the economic, historical and political conditions. As to this point please read the next chapter.

2) In Chapter IV of our book, this problem is taken up.

3) In *The Agrarian Programme of Social Democracy in the First Russian Revolution 1905-7*, Lenin stated "In England this reshaping proceeded in a revolutionary, violent way; but the violence was practised for the benefit of the landlords, it was practised on the masses of the peasants, who were taxed to exhaustion, driven from the villages, evicted and died out, or emigrated." (V. I. Lenin. *The Agrarian Programme*, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1954, Moscow p. 101.) This statement also confirms our conclusion. It seems that this is the generally accepted opinion in the Soviet academic circle. Of course there remains some differences of ideas. (Reference: Nobuo Take, "Study on English Revolution in the Soviet Union I. II", Keizai Ronso [Economic Review] (in Japanese). Vol. 78, No. 1, 2.) In East Germany, Roland Hauk takes the same viewpoint by criticizing the studies so far made in East Germany on English Revolution. (Junkichi Morii, "Roland Hauk's opinion as to Lenin's theory of 'two paths'", Shakaikagaku Ronso [Social science Review] (in Japanese), Vol. 10).

It is clear for everybody that Mikio Takeuchi's interpretation as to Lenin's passage cited above ("Agrarian and land problems, civil revolution", *Western Economic History Lectures*, Vol IV, p. 28.) is a sheer sophistry and distortion when it is compared with passages of Marx, Engels and Lenin cited here. I will discuss once again later as to Mr. Takeuchi's opinion.

Mr. Toya in 1952, pointed out that the enclosure movement is one of the types of "the Prussian path," and suggested such opinion on land reform in English Revolution that we are developing here,¹⁾ the opinion to take it contrary as "the American path" was predominant in the society of English History in Japan.

As I explained before, the ruling opinion is that the feudalistic land property had collapsed in an early stage, and for those who advocate this opinion, there can be no other conclusion but the victory by disintegration of the peasantry through "the American path". This paper is a criticism against their approach. Mr. Hisao Otsuka says, "Mr. Toya paying attention to the conflict between the development of industrial capitalism for farmers 'from below' or by peasantry with Crowley being a representative ideologue and the formation of large enclosures for sheep farming under the initiative of landlords, which is well known in the English economic history, he considers the former "the American path" and the latter "the Prussian path" in the course of capitalistic development. On the contrary, I took the both directions as two analogous subspecific types to be both included in 'the American path' development in a broad sense of the word and considered that the struggle between them was an internal conflict in the course of normal development of capitalism, although I admit the existence of conflict between them."²⁾ While Mr. Otsuka admits here the existence of conflict between them, he considers both of them two analogous subspecific types to be included in the course of development of "the American path." This attitude is quite natural for Mr. Otsuka, because for him feudalistic land property had already disappeared quickly and the peasant proprietorship of land parcels existed in general, and he cannot see any substantial conflict between "the development of industrial capitalism by peasantry", and "the formation of large enclosure under the initiative of landlord". As I stated before, Mr. Otsuka's interpretation as above is completely wrong and he does not understand the real existence of feudalistic land property.

Why can the land peasant reform and the enclosure movement for landlord be considered two analogous subspecific types of "the American path"? Mr. Mikitoshi Takeuchi tries to answer this question. "The development of modern landlord system in England depended on the internal change of peasantry, that is to say, appearance of capitalist tenant farmers improving tillage technics and accumulating capitals. The class of land-lords,

1) Toshiyuki Toya, *Memories from Toya Studies on English Yeoman*.

Hideichi Horie, "Mr. Dobb's *Studies on Economic History*", Minoru Toyosaki (ed.), *Dobb's Economic Theory*, Vol. I.

2) Hisao Otsuka, *On Toshiyuki Toya's Studies on English Yeoman*, Toya, op. cit., pp. 142-3.

adapting themselves to these transitions, accelerated expropriated exploitation of small scale land-owning peasants and rural community".¹⁾

Here Mr. Takeuchi considers, first, that the peasants' landownership had been already established and then on the basis of this landownership, the peasantry was disintegrated and the capitalistic tenant farmers were organized into a class; second, that, "corresponding" to the appearance of this capitalist tenant farmers, the landlords developed the enclosure movement for the interests of the former. It is clear that his first view is directly from Otsuka school which considers the development of English agricultural capitalism as "the American path", while according to his second view, the landlords are considered to represent the interests of the capitalistic tenant farmers and thereby the anti-peasant enclosure by landlords is taken as a form through which "the American path" is carried out. However, it is against the fact to conclude that peasants' land-ownership won in England and "the American path" was realized. Even if the peasants' landownership was successfully established, there should have been a historical intermediary link in order that the capitalist tenant farmers came out from the former, because the capitalist tenant farmers could appear only when the peasants' landownership was denied. Mr. Takeuchi does not present this intermediary link. Moreover, it is entirely against both historical fact and the theory to consider that at the stage of "petty commodity" production in agriculture at that time, capitalist tenant farmers had already formed a class strong enough to make landlords their representatives. Besides, it is not only against the historical fact that the landlord developed the enclosure movement by representing the interests of capitalist tenant farmers who had not yet been organized into a class, but also we cannot understand at all why the feudal landlords still existed in spite of the fact that the feudalistic land property had already been collapsed. The fact that the feudalistic landownership collapsed and peasants' landownership won means that the feudal lords had died out as was the case in France. It is therefore inconsistent to maintain that the ghost of such feudal lords represented the interests of capitalistic tenant farmers who had not yet been organized into a class.

Since Mr. Akihiko Yoshioka "discovered" the landownership of parasitic landlord, in England, Otsuka school started to think of the confrontation of "two paths" in the form of conflict between the change of parasitic landowners into capitalists and that of tenants into capitalists. When Mr. Yoshioka says, "I understand that the capitalistic disintegration

1) Mikitoshi Takeuchi, "Agrarian and Land Problems in Civil Revolution", *Western Economic History Lectures*, Vol IV, p. 28.

of peasantry would be brought forward as internal contradiction of land-ownership of parasitic landlords under the absolute monarchy, starting from initial stage of the manufacturing period as Marx put it, he meant what I wrote above."¹⁾

Mr. Otsuka, of course, agreed with him,²⁾ and the "two paths" of the English Revolution have come to be questioned in Otsuka school. However, Otsuka was divided into factions as to what was the goal of these "two paths" in the English Revolution; Mr. Yoshioka says that "the alliance between bourgeoisie and new nobles in the English Revolution was the shift to capitalism from above, viz. the transformation of parasitic landowners into cultivating landowners".³⁾ Mr. Masao Hamabayashi (who belongs to Otsuka's school at least judging from his way of thinking) says, "It may be right, if one sees just the surface of the matter and its progress for a very short period, to consider the English Revolution as a reform from above, carried out by land-lords. However, English Revolution is nevertheless the revolution from below but it did not reveal itself in a clear form of conflict between parasitic landowners and wealthy peasants. We must see its prematurity and compromise in that the rule of land-lords was at first maintained".⁴⁾ However, both of these opinions are quite identical in their presumption of "the two paths" on the relation between parasitic landowners and tenant farmers which is considered to have developed based upon the disintegration of real feudalistic land-property namely relations between feudal lords and subordinated peasants and upon the disintegration of peasants, landownership. In this respect their opinions are entirely different from our theory of "the two paths". Between Otsuka school and ourselves, there is no identical point except the common use of words. The theory of "the two paths" relates to the abolition of the domination of the feudal lords over the subordinated peasantry and not to that of the tenants. The historical facts clearly tell us that the various conflicts in the English Revolution were centered around the former and not the latter. In the face of a sheet of historical facts, Otsuka school looked for help in the theory of "the two paths", but here again they were completely defeated by the historical facts.

1) Akihiko Yoshioka, "Stratification of peasantry in England in the late middle age", *Studies on Parasitic landlords* System ed. by the Economic Society of Fukushima Univ. p. 62. At that time, Mr. Yoshioka seemed to interpret the English Revolution as revolution from below. However, he changed his view to the revolution from above as shown below.

2) Hisao Otsuka, *European Economic History*, pp. 178-181.

3) Akihiko Yoshioka, *Formation of Land-lord system*, p. 169.

4) cf. Masao Hamabayashi, *History of English Revolution*, pp. 178-181.

IV. Land Reform in English Revolution and Tripartite Division System

We have so far explained that in the English Revolution, the Prussian type land reform led by the landlords won the victory over the American type land reform by the initiative of the peasantry and that the subsequent land reforms were modernized according to the former line. The direction of English land reform indicates the expropriation and cleaning of the King's sovereign lordship that exercised restrictive control over the feudalistic land-ownership of the landlord, and of the feudalistic right of peasant's land holding that also exercised restrictive control over the feudalistic landownership of landlord from below, in order to change these lands into private-owned land of land-lord, which was then farmed by lord himself or rented as leasehold or to tenant at will. This was the same direction as followed by the manicipation of Prussian and Russian serfs, which liberated them from the status of serdom but at the same time cut off and integrated into the private land of lord a considerable portion of their allotment which had by then been held by the serfs. Furthermore, in England, unlike Prussia and Russia, this took place in the well-known form of enclosure movement and it was pushed forward more thoroughly and not only in the form of an exploitation of land but also for the purpose of grouping up of lands suitable for the operation of capitalistic agriculture. In this respect, England can be called a country where the primitive accumulation of capital advanced in a classic way. However, the English Revolution just fixed the said direction of land reform and the political path which supported this direction. It took further 200 years, until the first half of the 19th century, when this came to be completed, the landlords gradually realized the land reform which had been legally decided, and rapidly after they introduced Norfolk husbandry which corresponds with the manufactural stage in agriculture.

It would be necessary for me to explain how "the Prussian path" land reform favored by the landlord came to be combined with the tripartite division system that characterized the agricultural capitalism completed in England, because unless this combination is clarified, it would be impossible to relate our explanation to the subsequent development in England.

Anyhow, the academic circles of historical science in Japan implicitly consider as follows: "The American path" land reform performed at the initiative of peasants is connected directly with the tripartite division system, while "the Prussian path" land reform is not connected with the tripartite division system but directly with the Prussian type Junker system. As I already explained before, "the American path" land reform is not con-

nected directly with the tripartite division system. However, there is no evidence which shows that "the Prussian path" land reform is related directly to Junker system while it has nothing to do with the tripartite division system. In his "Expropriation of the Agricultural Population from the Land", Vol. I, Chapter XXVII of *Capital*, Marx explains as to England at first on the development of "free peasant proprietors" whose right of property was hidden under the feudal title" and then he gave detailed explanation on the enclosure movement by which the landlord expropriated these peasants' landholdings (land reform of "the Prussian path"). He then explained, in Chapter XXIV, "The Genesis of the Capitalist Farmer", how the landlord rented those lands which the lords had thus expropriated from the peasants to the capitalist tenant farmers as the leasehold. It can be said that his order of explanations showed the process of how "the Prussian path" land reform had come to be combined with the tripartite division system. Besides regarding Prussia itself, Marx cited in his *Capital*, Vol. III, Chapter LII, "Classes", the following passage from F. List's *Die Ackerverfassung, die Zwergwittschaft und die Auswanderung*, "The prevalence of a self-sufficient economy on large estates demonstrates solely the lack of civilization, means of communication, domestic trades and wealthy cities. It is to be encountered, therefore, throughout Russia, Poland, Hungary and Mecklenburg. Formerly, it is also prevalent in England, with the advance of trades and commerce, however, this was replaced by the breaking up into middle estates and the leasing of land".¹⁾ Marx here agreed with List saying "F. List remarks correctly". It is also said that Max Weber approves the inevitability of shift to the tripartite division system existed in Prussia and America, too.²⁾ If these opinions are taken into account, it would be necessary to reexamine the common sense which has been implicitly approved by Japanese academic circle of the economic history. "The Prussian path" land reform could develop either into Prussian Junker system or into the English tripartite division system, first of all according to the historical conditions under which it found itself. This could be also understood from the fact that the Junker system, tripartite division system in embryo and the landowner-farmer relation with rack rent coexisted in England until such time that the second enclosure movement was compelled. Under what conditions was "the Prussian path" land reform connected with the Prussian Junker system or with the English tripartite division system? Since there has been no positive study which was focused

1) K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. iii, p. 862.

2) Ryoichi Yamaoka, *Development of Agricultural Economic Theory*, pp. 114-5.

on this point, our explanation has more or less to be hypothetical.

As I explained already, in England, in the stage of money rent payment of feudalistic land property, the disintegration of the peasantry had considerably advanced among such peasants each other as copyholders and customary tenants, and the various agricultural capitalistic relations had been developing under feudalistic land property. The development of agricultural technics from the three field system to the Norfolk husbandry pushed further the disintegration of the peasantry under such historical conditions as industrial revolution and its world-wide monopoly of industry. However, this disintegration of the peasantry took place originally on the premise of land holding and the wealthy peasant was not the capitalist tenant farmer but the copyholder or customary tenant who accumulated the land holding. Therefore, such disintegration of the peasantry did not by itself mean the establishment of the tripartite division system. The land expropriation from peasants and villagers by the lords transformed, on one hand the wealthy peasants, into the capitalist tenant who were expropriated from their copyhold or customary land and came to produce on the lord's privately owned land. On the other hand, middle and poor peasants were pushed to ruin either directly land expropriation or indirectly by the rent increase and other heavy pressure. In case "the Prussian path" land reform was conditioned historically by a considerable progress of disintegration of the peasantry on the basis of peasants' land holding, it denied the old peasantry itself by expropriating their holding, while accelerating such disintegration, it absorbed and reorganized the results of the disintegration of such old peasantry on the new basis of private landownership of lord. The disintegration of the peasantry was connected to the said English tripartite division system via negative media of "the Prussian path" land reform. When Marx said that the transformation of customary legal relationship to pure money relationship between landlords and peasants in the establishment of money rent system "serves....., provided other general production relations permit, to expropriate more and more the old peasant possessors and to substitute capitalist tenants in their stead",¹⁾ he tried to point out the above mentioned fact by specifying particularly, provided other general production relations permit". Through the progress for almost 400 years of the development of peasants' holding against feudalistic land property→the enclosure movement by landlord→the tripartite division system, which was a long and painful history for peasants, the English modern agricultural system has come to be established.

1) Marx, *ibid.*

Table 2. Current British Agricultural Structure (1950 World Agriculture Census)

% of acreage by farming scale	Total	Less than 5 a.	5-50	50-100	100-250	250-500	500- 1,000	Over 1,000
	100%	0.7	8.4	11.4	27.3	17.7	9.8	24.7
Landownership	Total 100% land of farmer 39.6% lease 60.4%							

F.A.O., *Report of the Agriculture Census*, Vol. 1.

In case of Prussia, the emancipation of serf was done directly out of the second serfdom which had been too severe to permit any disintegration of the peasantry at all. Therefore the ex-landlord, who became just a private of land, could not find any wealthy peasant to whom he could entrust the management of land in order to obtain the revenue corresponding to the new productivity. Thus the ex-lords were obliged to transformed themselves into Junker by restricting in many ways the neighboring small peasants.

As France and the United States have different agricultural systems although both of them experienced the same "American path" land reform does not necessarily produce Prussian Junker type of agricultural system. "The Prussian path" land reform could also produce, under the said English historical conditions, the English type tripartite division system which could be a model of agricultural capitalism. As I explained before, in the circle of economic history in Japan, there exists opinion that since the tripartite division system is of classic agricultural capitalism, the English land reform should be "the American path". This view seems to exist also in East Germany. W. Schmidt, K. Bath, I. Klein and E. Schwertner whom Roland Hauk criticized as mentioned before, seem to take in principle this way of thinking although their opinions differ each other.¹⁾ Otsuka school which I criticized as above has created in Japan the same tradition of thinking. It is my eventual theme to refute the traditinal idea of combination between "the American path" land reform and the English tripartite division system, and to demonstrate that even "the Prussian path" land reform could create in England the tripartite division system, that is to say, agricultural capitalism.

P. S.—I should like to mention my debt to Mr. Christopher Hill who took the trouble to rent typescript and to point out some inadequate terminology.

1) Junkichi Morii, *op. cit.*